Amendments to the Specification:

Please amend the specification as follows:

Please replace paragraph bridging pages 18 and 19, starting on page 18, line 30 and ending on page 19, line 2, with the following rewritten paragraph:

Similarly, when the 100 rad (Si) is incident upon aluminum, 20 rad (Si) passes there through to provide a stopping power of 20 rad (Si). Thus, at this bin energy level, tungsten is preferred, because ~~the~~ its stopping power (radiation out) is ~~preferred~~ better, ~~since~~ and thus tungsten is preferred for blocking electrons.

Please replace the first full paragraph on page 19, lines 3-6, with the following rewritten paragraph:

Next, the proton radiation is considered. Assuming 100 rad (Si) is incident on ~~tungsten~~ aluminum, 30 rad (Si) passes therefrom to determine the stopping power. Also, assuming 100 rad (Si) is incident onto ~~aluminum~~ tungsten, 50rad (Si) stopping power results. As a result, aluminum has a preferred stopping power for protons at this energy level.

Please replace the third full paragraph on page 19, lines 10-16, with the following rewritten paragraph:

Thus, it may be seen that 100% aluminum is preferred as being overall more effective for stopping both electrons and protons. Also, a combination of both tungsten and aluminum would overall be less effective. For example, 50% tungsten and 50% aluminum would provide an effective or combined stopping power of 55 rad (Si), which is half way between the stopping power of tungsten and aluminum. As a result, since 100% aluminum exhibits a stopping power of 50 rad (Si), 100% aluminum is preferred over a mixture of aluminum and tungsten.